



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,473	03/01/2004	Juergen Bieber	Q79410	9022
23373	7590	10/01/2007		
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC 2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 800 WASHINGTON, DC 20037			EXAMINER CHANG, SUNRAY	
			ART UNIT 2121	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 10/01/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/788,473

Applicant(s)

BIEBER, JUERGEN

Examiner

Sunray Chang

Art Unit

2121

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 July 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,5-11 and 13-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4 and 12 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,6-11,13 and 15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5 and 14 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

Art Unit: 2121

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This office action is in responsive to the paper filed on July 16<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

Claims 1 – 3, 5 – 11 and 13 – 15 are presented for examination.

Claims 1 – 3, 6 – 11 and 13 and 15 are rejected.

Claims 5 and 14 are objected to.

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

2. **claims 1 – 3, 6 and 10 are rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robert J. Kretschmann (U.S. Patent No. 6,167,464, and referred to as **Kretschmann** hereinafter) and in view of Jeffrey A. Brannan (U.S. Patent No. 5,879,092 and referred to as **Brannan** hereinafter).

(**Kretschmann** as set forth above generally discloses the basic inventions.)

**Regarding independent claim 1,**

**Kretschmann** teaches,

- A method of displaying a video signal on the display of a mobile display device, [a number of programs that may be invoked to provide data and communicate with a portable HMI to display particular I/O data of I/O table or particular portions of the control program, Col. 5, lines 45 – 50] comprising:
  - transmitting a signal which identifies an installation part of an industrial installation by a transmitter of the installation part; [location information, Col. 6, lines 1 – 3; location signal changes and the data and program which it executes changes accordingly, Abstract]
  - receiving the transmitted signal by a receiver of the mobile display device; [location information is received by the second antenna and the tag reader of the portable HMI, Col. 6, lines 1 – 3]
  - automatically relaying the received signal, or a transmission signal derived from the received signal, by the mobile display device to an analysis station; [relayed via bus to microprocessor ... relays information to central processor, Col. 6, lines 1 – 6; further Col. 4, lines 44 – 50. and 51 – 54]
  - the analysis station automatically transmitting information pertaining to the installation part to the mobile display device; [solutions are transmitted to the HMI, Col. 5, lines 4 – 6; a number of programs that maybe invoked to provide data to a portaqble HMI to display particular I/O data of the control program, Col. 5, lines 45 – 49] and

Art Unit: 2121

- automatically displaying a video signal corresponding to the information pertaining to the installation part on the display of the mobile display device. [a number of programs that maybe invoked to provide data to a portable HMI to display particular I/O data of the control program, Col. 5, lines 45 – 49]

**Kretschmann** does not teach in the case of the reception of a plurality of different signals transmitted by transmitters in different installation parts, different priorities are automatically assigned to the received signals

**Brannan** teaches,

- in the case of the reception of a plurality of different signals transmitted by transmitters in different installation parts, different priorities are automatically assigned to the received signals. [movement is sensed by a detector, amount of paper remaining is sensed by a second detector, Fault signals are generated by a electronic circuit responsive to several conditions, Abstract; only the most severe paper jams that trigger signals indicating a malfunction in other components are generally detected by existing automated teller machines, Col. 2, lines 7 – 21] for the purpose of indicating fault conditions [Abstract].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of **Kretschmann** to include “the radio signal is transmitted only when there is a problem”, for the purpose of indicating fault conditions [Abstract].

**Regarding dependent claim 2, Kretschmann** teaches,

The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein

Art Unit: 2121

- the signal identifying the installation part comprises a radio signal, and the radio signal is transmitted as a constant pulsating signal. [Col. 4, lines 53 – 54 and Col. 6, lines 1 – 3]

**Regarding dependent claims 3 and 10,**

**Kretschmann** teaches a radio signal, and the radio signal is transmitted from the installation part.

**Kretschmann** does not teach the radio signal is transmitted only when there is a problem.

**Brannan** teaches the radio signal is transmitted only when there is a problem, for the purpose of indicating fault conditions [Abstract].

**Regarding dependent claim 6, Kretschmann teaches,**

The method as claimed in claim 1, wherein

- an analysis station pertaining to the installation part transmitting the signal is determined in the mobile display device on the basis of the received signal, and the received signal, or a transmission signal derived from the received signal, is relayed to the analysis station thus determined. [Col. 5, lines 45 – 56]

3. **Claim 13 is rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Kretschmann**, in view of **Brannan**, and further in view of Marcus Escobosa (U.S. Patent No. 5,963,145 and referred to as **Escobosa** hereinafter).

**Regarding dependent Claim 13,**

**Kretschmann** teaches reception of signals transmitted by transmitters in different installation parts. [Fig. 1 and 2]

**Brannan** teaches priority for prioritizing assigning signals. [Only the most severe paper jams that trigger signals indicating a malfunction in other components are generally detected by existing automated teller machines, Col. 2, lines 7 – 21]

**Escobosa** teaches selecting equipment to receive and assign signals [Abstract], for the purpose of providing wireless pointer control, [Abstract]

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the teaching of **Kretschmann** to include the teaches of **Brannan** and **Escobosa** for the purpose of providing wireless pointer control.

4. Claims 7 – 9, 11 and 15 have been considered and examined, yet, have been rejected with the same reasons indicated above.

5. Claims 5 and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

*Response to Amendment*

**Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102 & 103**

6. Applicants amend the independent claims 1 and 7 to include the limitations in forth claims 4 and 12 to overcome the 102(b) rejection, yet, the claims 4 and 12 have been rejected by the combination of **Kretschmann** and **Brannan** in forth office action. The applicants claim for assigning different priority to each of the received signals in response to the reception of different signals. **Brannan** teaches two detectors detecting different conditions and further teaches the most severe paper jams that trigger signals indicating a malfunction which indicates at least one most severe condition and one not sufficiently severe condition.

7. Regarding claims 5 and 14, been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims 1 and 7.



Art Unit: 2121

**Conclusion**

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sunray Chang who may be reached Monday through Friday, between 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. EST. via telephone number (571) 272-3682 or facsimile transmission (571) 273-3682 or email [sunray.chang@uspto.gov](mailto:sunray.chang@uspto.gov).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on (571) 272-3687.

The official facsimile transmission number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.



Anthony Knight  
Supervisory Primary Examiner  
Group Art Unit 2121  
Technology Center 2100  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office

September 27, 2007